

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

Claims 1-2, 4-39 and 41-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katariya et al. (USPN 6,473,753) in view of Gruen et al. (USPN 6,393,460).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-3, 5, 12-13, 20-27, 34-35, 38-42, 49, 56-64, 71-72, and 75-78 have been amended and claims 37, 74 and 79 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-38, 39-73, and 75-78 are pending and under consideration.

Reconsideration is requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-2, 4-39 AND 41-79 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

In the Office Action, at pages 2-8, claims 1-2, 4-39 and 41-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katariya et al. (USPN 6,473,753) in view of Gruen et al. (USPN 6,393,460).

These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 1, 38 and 75 have been amended and are now deemed to be patentable over Katariya et al. (USPN 6,473,753) in view of Gruen et al. (USPN 6,393,460), as discussed more fully below. In addition, the claims depending from amended claims 1, 38 and 75 are deemed to be allowable for at least the reasons that amended claims 1, 38 and 75 are allowable.

In amended claims 1, 38 and 75 of the present invention, the key words stored in the memory means are associated with a message transmitting/receiving or information processing apparatus. The invention detects an occurrence of a transmitted or a received message, and extracts, in response to the detection of an occurrence of a received message, a keyword from the received message. The invention dynamically determines a degree of importance of the extracted keyword to update the keywords for the apparatus and the degrees of importance, and provides an indication of the occurrence of the extracted keyword within the received message in accordance with the determined degree of importance of the extracted keyword.

Katariya et al. (US 6,473,753 B1) discloses a weighting system for calculating the weight for a term within one document. It is respectfully submitted that Katariya et al. is not relevant to the present invention.

In Katariya et al., the weighting system first generates a term frequency that represents the number of times that the term occurs in the one document. The weighting system also may use various different algorithms for generating an improved term frequency that more accurately represents the importance of a term. The weighting system uses various factors, such as the formatting (e.g., italics) of a term and the number of unique terms within the document, to generate the improved term frequency.

Katariya et al., however, neither discloses nor suggests the dynamic determination of a degree of importance of a keyword extracted from currently received message to update the keywords for the particular apparatus and the degrees of importance, for indication of the occurrence of the extracted keyword in accordance with the determined degree of importance, as recited in claims 1, 38 and 75.

Gruen et al. (US 5, 691, 708 B1) discloses a method for informing a user of topics of discussion in a recorded chat between two or more people. Words satisfying predetermined statistical criteria represent topics of discussion in a chat between people, and are considered important for people, but not for one person.

Gruen et al., however, neither discloses nor suggests the dynamic determination of a degree of importance of a keyword extracted from currently received message to update the keywords for the particular apparatus and the degrees of importance, for indication of the occurrence of the extracted keyword in accordance with the determined degree of importance, as recited in claims 1, 38 and 75. In the present invention, the key word and the degree of importance of the word are determined for a particular apparatus of a user, but not for a plurality of apparatuses or people.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 38 and 75 as amended are allowable. Claims 2-36 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1 and hence are deemed to be allowable. Claims 39-73 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 38 and hence are deemed to be allowable. Claims 76-78 depend from amended claim 75 and hence are deemed to be allowable.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-2, 4-39 and 41-79 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are patentable over Katariya et al. (USPN 6,473,753) in view of Gruen et al. (USPN 6,393,460).

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3 AND 40 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

In the Office Action, at pages 9, Claims 3 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katariya et al. (USPN 6,473,753) in view of Gruen et al. (USPN 6,393,460) and further in view of Batchelder et al. (USPN 5,691,708).

These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 38 have been amended (see above discussion). Claims 3 and 40 depend from amended claims 1 and 38, respectively.

Katariya et al. (USPN 6,473,753) and Gruen et al. are discussed above.

Batchelder et al. (US 5,691,708) discloses a text message abstraction system. Any time a particular word appears in a location corresponding to one of the parameters, "points" are attributed to that word based upon the assigned parameter value. If the word does not reach the particular threshold, then its significance is assigned the value of the particular parameter. Words having a significance value below a certain pre-determined threshold may be removed from the abstracted message.

Batchelder et al., however, neither discloses nor suggests dynamic determination of a degree of importance of a keyword extracted from currently received message to update the keywords for the particular apparatus and the degrees of importance, for indication of the occurrence of the extracted keyword in accordance with the determined degree of importance, as recited in claims 1 and 38.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 40 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and are patentable over Katariya et al. (USPN 6,473,753) in view of Gruen et al. (USPN 6,393,460) and further in view of Batchelder et al. (USPN 5,691,708).

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

Ser. No. 09/788,388

Docket No. 1573.1002

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

July 23, 2003

By:

H.J. Staas

Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501